7:Freed E-5 (1952-1957)1960 NT20 Washo NT20

[P. 349, A]

CHANGING WASHO KINSHIP

BY

STANLEY A. FREED

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents a study of Washo social organization and of the changes which have occurred within it since the end of the aboriginal period. It is particularly concerned with discovering the causes of a number of alternate kinship terms which together appear to constitute a new, emerging system of kinship terminology. The hypothesis here advanced to account for the alternate kinship terms is that changes occurring outside of social organization can affect the terminological system without first modifying elements of formal social structure, such as residence rules or rules of descent. This hypothesis is based on the assumptions that kinship terminology is closely correlated with patterned norms of behavior, or roles, and that these roles may vary considerably within the limits set by a given kind of social organization. Cultural changes can therefore cause terminological change by altering role behavior without affecting the formal social structure.

In order to test the assumption of a close correlation of role behavior and kinship terminology, I have devised a technique, called the role profile test, which yields an objective description of role behavior. The data from the role profile test show that Washo role behavior agrees closely with the emerging system of kinship terminology. The close correlation of role behavior and terminological system and the occurrence of changes in the Washo system of kinship terminology despite a relatively stable social structure support the hypothesis that roles may vary markedly within the limits set by a given type of social structure, the variation being due to causes which lie outside of social organization.

The study is based on six months of field work among the Washo living in Carson City and Dresslerville, Nevada, and Woodfords and Markleeville, California. Four trips were made: during the first two,

7:Preed E-5 (1952-1957)1960 NT20 Washo NT20
[P 365, A]

601
114
178
554

> differentiating them is lacking. Immateriality appears chiefly with respect to distant relatives. In the English kinship system, for example, it operates as an equalizer to favor the extension of the term "cousin" to various distant relatives of little importance, without reference to distinctions of sex, generation, or collaterality.

Murdock's similarities and differences are aspects of role behavior, but they are aspects which are strongly determined by elements of formal social structure. This being so, he can trace the effects of social structure upon systems of kinship terminology without dealing with role behavior, for it is so closely tied to the formal social structure as to lack the characteristics of an independent variable. This thesis suggests that roles are characterized by many more qualities than those listed by Murdock and that some of them vary considerably within the limits set by a given type of social structure. Cultural changes can therefore cause terminological change by altering role behavior without affecting the formal social structure.

The role concept has been used in various ways by other authors. Radcliffe-Brown (1935) once argued that apparent discrepancies between social structures and terminological systems in some Californian tribes were due to the fact that systems of terminology correlate with "social usage" rather than gross social structure. Radcliffe-Brown's social usage seems roughly equivalent to role behavior. Role behavior has been used explicitly in two recent kinship studies: Schneider and Roberts (1956) propose the concept of role to account for alternate usages in the Zuni kinship systems; and Schneider and Homans (1955) suggest that alternate terms in the American kinship system, such as "father," "dad," and "pop," reflect differences in role behavior. The central hypothesis of this monograph derives directly from these two papers.

601
178
554

From the hypothesis that roles and terms are closely correlated and are capable of being influenced by cultural factors we may draw the following inferences regarding Washo role behavior and the emerging Washo kinship system. Since cousins are being terminologically distinguished from siblings, the roles for cousins and siblings should be significantly different. The role of mother's brother should not be significantly different from the role of father's brother, and the role of brother's child should not differ significantly from the role of sister's child, for in both cases, kin-types which are distinguished in the standard terminology are merged in the alternate terminological system. The roles associated with the rest of the standard kinship terms should all differ significantly from one another because they have remained terminologically distinct.

It is apparent that an explanation based on detailed comparisons of roles cannot use subjective assessments of similarities and differences between roles. A technique for describing roles is required which yields data that can be treated statistically. Such a technique, called the role profile test, was developed for this research. It is thought to give a more exact and sensitive picture of Washo role behavior than that which may be obtained solely through observations and interviews, and the statistical analysis of the test protocols gives an objective measure of similarities and differences in role behavior.

The inferences presented above will be tested with data derived from use of the role profile test. It will

601
178
554

be seen that the data strongly support the foregoing inferences, thereby supporting the validity of the assumption of a close fit between role and term. The close correlation of role and term together with the fact that the Washo kinship system is changing in spite of a relatively stable social structure supports the hypothesis that roles may vary considerably within the limits set by a given configuration of social structure, the variation being due to causes which lie outside of the social organization.

THE ROLE PROFILE TEST

125 ●
602

The role profile test makes use of sixteen categories for describing interpersonal behavior developed by Freedman, Leary, Ossorio, and Coffey (1951). I have slightly modified the categories and converted them into a questionnaire, which appears below. As conceived by Freedman and his associates, the sixteen categories were arranged in a circle. This emphasizes an important feature of the conceptual scheme. It has four nodal points: dominance, affiliation, submission, and hostility. These nodal points occur in the questionnaire at Question 1 (dominance), Question 5 (affiliation), Question 9 (submission), and Question 13 (hostility). The questions between the nodes combine the nodal qualities in varying degrees. For example, "to teach" (Question 2) is a combination of dominance and affiliation; "to punish" (Question 14) is a combinstion of hostility and dominance.

Questionnaire of the Role Profile Test

1. Which relative most often tries to tell you what to do? Which most often gives you orders (or bosses you)?
2. Which relative most often teaches you how to do something? Which one gives you advice or tells you his opinions?
3. Which relative is most likely to help you if you need it?
4. Which relative is most likely to feel bad and sympathize with you when something goes wrong?
5. Which relative is specially fond of you?
6. Which relative most often coöperates (works together) with you?
7. Which relative depends on you most and most often asks your help?
8. Which relative respects you the most? Which one asks your opinions?
9. Which relative obeys (minds) you if you tell him or her to do something?
10. Which relative is most eager for your approval?
11. Which relative would be the most likely to say or think you did something wrong (or bad)?
12. Which relative nags you most?
13. Which relative disapproves of you and criticizes you most often?
14. Which relative punishes you or gets angry (or mad) if you don't mind or if you do something wrong (or bad)?
15. Which relative is most likely to refuse you help even if you need it pretty badly?
16. Which relative would be most likely not to want to have anything at all to do with you?

The role profile test is administered as follows.

125 ●
602

The informant is provided with slips of paper containing Washo kinship terms written quasiphonetically for all the relatives he possesses in first ascending, ego's, and first descending generations. These, of course, differ from person to person. The informant is then asked to arrange the slips of paper in a column in response to each of the sixteen questions. The relative ranking highest in the behavior questioned is to be placed at the top of the column; the remainder are to be ranked in descending order, with the one ranking lowest in the behavior in question to be placed at the bottom. The first few questions are for practice and designed to acquaint the informant with the kind of response desired. The investigator asks "which of your relatives weighs most . . . is tallest . . . is oldest" or some other similar question, and instructs the informant to arrange the slips of paper, helping him if necessary. Once the "set" of the experiment is established, the questionnaire is administered. The questions are explained to the informant, using examples if necessary; they are not read mechanically. The informant's responses are noted for each question, and the paper slips are shuffled before the next question is given. The result is a test protocol ranking a person's relatives in each of the sixteen categories of interpersonal behavior.

Several precautions must be observed if the test results are to attain their maximum reliability. First, the investigator must determine the opportunity the informant has had for knowing and interacting with the relatives to be included in the test. If there has been a reasonable opportunity for interacting with a relative, he is to be included in the test even if the informant has had little interaction with him. If there has been no opportunity for interaction, the relative should be excluded. For example, if a relative has lived close to the informant for many years, he is to be included even though the informant rarely sees him. In this case, the opportunity for interaction exists, and the fact that none has taken place may be an important feature of the role behavior. However, if a relative died when the informant was a baby, or lives at a great distance, or is feeble-minded, he is to be excluded, for the informant has had no opportunity to interact with him.

124
125

Second, the same interpreter should be used for all informants. This should not be taken too literally, for feuds and hard feelings can make the presence of particular interpreters unpleasant to informants. In addition, if the interpreter is related to the informant, this might tend to influence the informant's responses. It is probably best to use an interpreter who is not related to the informant. This precaution could not be observed for two Washo informants owing to the prevailing rules of courtesy. These two informants were slightly deaf and it was necessary to shout at them. Among the Washo, it is considered impolite for a person to shout at a nonrelative. Therefore, relatives had to be used as interpreters.

[576]

Third, the testing situation should be standardized. This means that as few relatives as possible should be looking over the informant's shoulder while he is taking the test. An easy way to shed distracting relatives is to conduct the interview in an automobile.

125

Fourth, the questions should be asked randomly. I suspect that there is some contagion from one question to the next. This is enhanced if, for example, all the questions probing dominance are asked one after the other. By randomizing the questions, the investigator

125

can break up a developing pattern in an informant's responses. This precaution was not followed in the present study because its importance was not realized until the field work was almost completed.

125
123

Finally, the sample tested should be random. This is probably the most difficult of all the precautions to observe, for many persons will refuse to work with the investigator. Approximately twenty Washo refused with varying degrees of firmness to work with me. Of these, probably half would have eventually weakened because I could have brought pressure to bear through some of their relatives. This still would leave a sizable number of adamant refusals. In small, homogeneous groups like the Washo, the lack of a random sample is probably less serious than in larger, more heterogeneous societies.

125

In the present study, the above-mentioned precautions were carried out less fully than they might have been because the importance of some of them became clear only as the work progressed. The first four may be observed with no particular difficulty. I regard numbers one and four as particularly important. The problem of obtaining a random sample presents the most difficulty, but the effort must be made so that statistically valid inferences may be drawn about the larger population.

125
554

The role profile test deals only with the qualitative characteristics of roles. It indicates that a role ranks high in teaching or helping or fondness and low in submission or hostility. But roles also differ in their content. For example, both mother and father help a person, but the nature of the help differs. The mother cooks for an individual and mends his clothes; the father helps him to fix his car or to build a house. The role profile test tells us only that something is taught, but it does not tell us what is taught. The content of the teaching or helping or punishing distinguishes roles as much as the qualities of the roles. Among the Washo, the differences in the content of roles generally follow sexual lines. For the most part, this study does not deal with these differences in content; but it will be seen that content must be taken into account in distinguishing between the roles of the members of the nuclear family who are of opposite sex and in the same generation.

THE SAMPLE TESTED

125

The role profile test was administered to 47 of approximately 280 Washo living in the vicinity of Gardnerville, Nevada, and Woodfords, California. An effort was made to select a sample with an equal number of men and women, and one in which the young, middle-aged, and old were represented fairly equally. However, the persons within these categories were not selected randomly. The sample contains 20 men: five are thirty-five years of age or younger; 9 are from thirty-six to fifty-four years of age; and 6 are fifty-five years of age or older. The sample contains 27 women: 10 are thirty-five years of age or younger; 11 are thirty-six to fifty-four years of age; and 6 are fifty-five years of age or older. No one was tested who was under fourteen or who had less than seven different kinds of relatives. This reduced the number of young people who could be tested. The reluctance of the older Washo to mention dead relatives meant that many of the older people would not give all their relatives in the genealogical interviews, or would re-

[124]

7:Freed E-5 (1952-1957)1960 NT20 Washo NT20
[P. 367, A]

125
[124]
[602]

fuse to be interviewed at all. This reduced somewhat the number of old people in the sample. Two people could not finish the test: one old woman, after completing four questions, burst into tears at the mention of a dead relative; and a young woman could not finish the last six questions, for she rejected the idea that any of her relatives could be hostile. The questions these women finished are perfectly usable and have been included in the analysis.

The sample includes 4 blind people, 4 others with whom I had to use interpreters, and 8 people who were illiterate. None of these 16 persons could manipulate the slips of paper by themselves. They could take the test, for they retained a mental list of the relatives involved and verbally directed the investigator as to the arrangement of the slips. The order of relatives was read back to them and they continued to make adjustments until they were satisfied. They handled the test fairly well, but not so well as people who could arrange the slips of paper themselves. This fact probably increases the variability of the protocols.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

128
554

The purpose of this analysis is to reduce the data to a form in which the patterns of role behavior become apparent, and their similarities and differences can easily be compared. Since the sample was not chosen at random from the population, inferences drawn from it about the larger population are, statistically speaking, dangerous.

Two factors make the handling of the data troublesome: (1) the number of relatives contained in the particular protocols is different, ranging from seven to fourteen; and (2) protocols with the same number of relatives often contain different kinds of relatives. The ordinary, nonparametric methods of treating ranked data assume that each individual ranks the same set of objects. Another possible method of analysis involves the construction of preference matrices for all relatives in all sixteen behavioral categories. This idea was discarded because the size of the matrices, together with the variability and the smallness of the numbers in the cells, did not seem to promise sufficient returns for the work involved.

Consequently, the question of quantifying the data was studied. Because of the unequal number of relatives in the various protocols and because the relatives were often different in kind, some sort of metric seemed unavoidable. Consider a specific category of behavior and assume that the characteristic which determines a person's rank can be measured numerically and is distributed normally in the population. Let X equal the numerical value of the characteristic. Then X is a normally distributed random variable which, for convenience and with no loss of generality, we can assume has mean zero and variance one, that is, approximately 68 per cent of the population have values of X between -1 and +1. Thus, there are a few individuals who have the characteristic to a marked positive degree leading to an almost certain rank of one in any comparison, and a few individuals who have the characteristic to a marked negative degree leading to an almost certain lowest rank.

Now suppose that you have a judge and you take a random sample of n individuals from the population and ask him to rank them. Further, suppose that you repeat this indefinitely with samples of n. Now consider

merging of mother's brother and father's brother and of brother's child and sister's child probably is due to three major causes. The first is the individualization of the society, which reduces the importance of relatives not in the nuclear family; the second is the loss of nonsororal polygyny; and the third is the knowledge of the English kinship terminology, which may function as a kind of model for the new Washo kinship terminology. The cultural causes of the changes in Washo kinship terminology suggested here must be regarded only as hypotheses. Their verification requires comparative data.

554
601
178
602

CONCLUSION

The role profile test provided much of the data upon which the foregoing demonstration has been based. It has shown itself to be a useful and sensitive instrument for the collection of role data. Its principal value is that it can be treated statistically, and this permits objective role comparisons within a society. Such comparisons can be made just as easily between societies, provided the same statistical analysis is used. The test has some limitations. First, it deals only with the qualities of roles and does not test for their content. Second, the categories may have to be modified from society to society, for there is no certainty that the categories used for the Washo would be satisfactory for other tribes. The test is not meant to replace observation and interviewing; but at the same time it reveals role patterning that would escape all but the most careful and prolonged field work. The role profile test seems to me a most promising technique for the study of role behavior.

554
125

A RECONSTRUCTION OF ABORIGINAL WASHO SOCIAL ORGANIZATION[1*]

by Stanley A. Freed

The reconstruction of aboriginal Washo social structure presented here is based upon the publications of earlier investigators and upon data that my wife and I collected in the course of about six months' field work in the summers of 1952, 1953, 1956 and the winter of 1956-57. The major sources on aboriginal Washo social organization are: Barrett (1917), Curtis (1926), Kroeber (1907; 1917), Lowie (1939), and Siskin (1941). Our field data consist principally of interviews with 70 informants who ranged in age from 10 to over 80. Genealogical data, kinship terminology, census material, and brief life histories were collected from all informants. The testimony of our older informants regarding aboriginal conditions and the earlier published reports almost always agree, and thereby make possible a reconstruction of aboriginal Washo social organization that is probably relatively sound. The changes in Washo social structure since aboriginal times will be mentioned here, but a discussion of the probable causes of these changes has been omitted because such an analysis has appeared in an earlier paper (Freed, 1960).

In addition to a description of kinship terminology, residence rules, marriage patterns and other customary categories of analysis of social organization, this paper will attempt to describe role behavior among kinsmen in aboriginal times. This description is based on data from role profile tests taken by 47 Washo in the winter of 1956-57, and therefore pertains to modern role behavior (Freed, 1960, 365-70). The degree to which these patterns of modern role behavior resemble those of aboriginal times cannot be determined with any certainty because the published sources contain virtually no information on role behavior; also, attempts to elicit statements of aboriginal role behavior from elderly informants were unproductive. However, it is possible to make a tentative estimate of the degree to which modern and aboriginal role behavior resemble each other on the basis of a general appraisal of Washo acculturation. The Washo are still a recognizable group; they speak their own language; and, in modified form, they practice a number of aboriginal culture patterns (Freed, 1960). For these reasons we can assume that role behavior among the modern Washo gives some indication of aboriginal role behavior.

Kinship Terminology

The kinship terminology of the aboriginal Washo may be established with relative confidence because the terminologies collected by Kroeber (1907; 1917) and Lowie (1939) not only agree closely with each other but also with

*Notes are at ends of papers.

The Washo had weak agamous moieties whose only apparent function was to oppose each other in games at the annual pinenut dance (Freed, 1960, 361). Actually, three "moieties" were present, but one of them divided its members between the other two when participating in games; hence, the system was fundamentually dual. A person belonged to his father's moiety, which often was also his mother's moiety. When people of different moities married, they could join whichever moiety they wished. One of our male informants claims that a woman always joined her husband's moiety. Lowie says that in the hand game, a man could leave his own moiety and join the opposite moiety if it were having better luck (Lowie, 1939, 304). The moiety system does not exist today.

Settlements were very small. Lowie (1939, 303) states that the usual settlement had two to four houses, and that no village had as many as 10 houses. Neighbors were often kinsmen, but they might also be non-relatives. Modern Washo settlements are much larger than aboriginal ones; the largest, Dresslerville, Nevada, has a population of approximately 200.

Marriage

Curtis (1926, 97) and Barrett (1917, 9) report that polygyny was formerly practiced. Barrett notes that monogamy was as prevalent as polygyny. Lowie (1939, 309) says that both sororal and nonsororal polygyny existed, with a tendency to favor the sororal form because the Washo believed that strange women will fight. Barrett says that a man's choice of subsequent wives was not restricted. Both the sororate and the levirate occurred. Both were correct but not compulsory, according to Lowie. Curtis states that a widow had to marry her husband's brother if he desired her. Our informants support Lowie, both with regard to the preference for sororal as opposed to nonsororal polygyny and the noncompulsory character of the levirate. Polygyny, the sororate, and the levirate are no longer practiced. Many of the modern Washo contract a series of monogamous marriages with the earlier ones often of short duration and the later ones lasting considerably longer. Some Washo remain with their original marriage partners for life.

Role Behavior

The following descriptions of the role behavior of relatives in ego's generation and the first ascending and descending generations are based on the role profile test. The relatives of the second and third ascending and descending generations were not included when the test was given. However, a

602
125
554

brief description of the behavior of relatives separated by two or three generations is included. This is based upon observations and a few rather general statements of informants.

The administration and analysis of the role profile tests and the characteristics of the group of people who took them are described in Freed (1960). The role profile test asks 16 questions probing various features of interpersonal behavior. The questionnaire is given below. All the questions are related to four general qualities of interpersonal interaction: dominance, submission, affiliation and hostility. The strongest and purest expressions of these qualities are in questions one (dominance), five (affiliation), nine (submission), and 13 (hostility). The questions between any two of these attempt to combine their qualities in varying degrees. For example, "to teach" (question two) combines dominance and affiliation; "to respect" (question eight) combines affiliation and submission; "to nag" (question 12) combines submission and hostility; and "to refuse help" (question 15) combines hostility and dominance. The data of the role profile test can be quantified, and this permits an objective description and comparison of roles. The quantitative treatment of roles and their similarities and differences is given in Freed (1960). This paper will describe roles only in qualitative terms.

Questionnaire of the Role Profile Test

(The words in parentheses were useful in improving the informants' understanding of the questions)

1. Which relative most often tries to tell you what to do? Which most often gives you orders (or bosses you)?

2. Which relative most often teaches you how to do something? Which one gives you advice or tells you his opinions?

3. Which relative is most likely to help you if you need it?

4. Which relative is most likely to feel bad and sympathize with you when something goes wrong?

5. Which relative is specially fond of you?

6. Which relative most often cooperates (works together) with you?

125 602 554

7. Which relative depends on you most and most often asks your help?

8. Which relative respects you the most? Which one asks your opinions?

9. Which relative obeys (minds) you if you tell him or her to do something?

10. Which relative is most eager for your approval?

11. Which relative would be the most likely to say or think you did something wrong (or bad)?

12. Which relative nags you most?

13. Which relative disapproves of you and criticizes you most often?

14. Which relative punishes you or gets angry (or mad) if you don't mind or if you do something wrong (or bad)?

15. Which relative is most likely to refuse you help even if you need it pretty badly?

16. Which relative would be most likely not to want to have anything at all to do with you?

125 157 554 602

Father. This is a dominant relative. He rates fairly high in affiliation, rather neutral in submission, and generally low in hostility. Despite his low score in hostility, the father is a disciplinarian for both men and women as shown by his high score on question 14 (to punish). Women see him as a mildly suspicious and disapproving figure as shown by a fairly high score on question 11. The role of father differs considerably for men and women in teaching (question 2). A father instructs his sons much more than his daughters.

Father's brother. This role differs markedly for men and women. Father's brother is a much more important relative for men than for women as shown by his higher scores when rated by men on all questions except the last two, which show rejection. The role of father's brother for men is similar to that of father except that father scores significantly higher on the first two questions (to order and to teach). For women, father's brother is an unimportant relative, with low scores on all questions, except the last two.

Father's sister. She is a rather cold and hostile relative for both men and women. She scores high only on hostility (questions 11 to 13) and

rejection (questions 15 and 16). She possesses no disciplinary power either for men or women as shown by her low score on question 14 (to punish). 157 125 602 554

Mother. The mother's role is similar to the father's. She scores high in dominance and affiliation. Her score in submission is higher than father's. She scores low in hostility, but, like father, she is a disciplinarian as indicated by her fairly high score on question 14 (to punish). There is no contradiction between a high score in dominance and also a rather high score in submission. This means only that when the mother becomes old she sometimes may be dependent upon her children. Women see their mothers as much more suspicious than do men, as indicated by the mother's significantly higher score on question 11 (to suspect wrongdoing) when rated by women.

Mother's brother. His scores are neutral in dominance and affiliation and low in submission. He is a more suspicious and hostile figure for women than for men, as shown by his high score on questions 11 (to suspect wrongdoing) and 15 (to refuse help) when rated by women. For men, he is an unimportant relative with low or neutral scores on all questions except the last, which shows rejection.

Mother's sister. This relative is a much more dominating figure for women than for men. She is neutral in affiliation for both men and women, scores higher in submission for males, and scores rather high in hostility for both. Noteworthy features of her role are the high score on question 2 (to teach) for women and the rather high score for both men and women on question 13 (to disapprove).

Older brother. The most noteworthy feature of this role is its neutrality. Older brother's scores are neither very high nor very low on any question. His role is very similar for both men and women. The lack of distinctiveness in the role of older brother is probably due to his position as a relative older than ego yet of the same generation. This gives the role of elder brother elements of both superiority and equality which tend to neutralize each other.

Younger brother. The role of younger brother also lacks distinctive features; the reason is probably the same as in the case of older brother: younger brother is younger than ego, but a member of his generation. The roles of older and younger brother differ considerably in dominance; older brother is much more dominating than younger. The role of younger brother is very similar for men and women.

Older sister. The role of older sister is quite different for men and women. For women, she is a dominating, very cooperative, and rather critical relative as shown by her high scores on questions 1 (to order), 2 (to

157
125
602
554

teach), 6 (to cooperate), and 13 (to disapprove). For men, older sister is rather neutral regarding affiliation; she scores somewhat higher on both submission and dominance; and she is a very critical relative, as shown by her high scores on questions 11 (to suspect wrongdoing), 12 (to nag), 13 (to disapprove), 15 (to refuse help), and 16 (to reject).

Younger sister. The role of younger sister is quite similar to that of younger brother. She rates low or neutral in dominance, affiliation and hostility. Her rather high score on question 9 when rated by males shows that she obeys her older brother reasonably well.

Son. Son scores low on dominance and hostility and high on affiliation and submission when rated by men. The role of son is generally the same for women informants, except that son is a somewhat more hostile relative, as shown by his higher scores on questions 12 to 14, when rated by women.

Daughter. For men, daughter scores very low in dominance, neutral in affiliation, and very low in hostility. Her only noticeably high score, when rated by men, is on question 9 (to obey). For women, daughter scores low in dominance, but not nearly as low as she scores for men. Daughter scores higher in affiliation for women than for men, as shown by her higher scores on questions 6 (to cooperate), 7 (to depend), and 8 (to respect). Daughter also scores noticeably higher on question 12 (to nag) for women than for men.

Brother's child. This is a relative with whom there is little interaction either by men or women. Scores are low for almost all questions. Brother's child's highest score is on question 9 (to obey) for men. He ranks very low in dominance, a bit higher in affection, low to neutral in submission, and low in hostility for both men and women.

Sister's child. The role of this relative is very similar to that of brother's child. Her scores are low on all questions. She is a slightly more hostile figure toward men than is brother's child.

[603]
[586]

Relatives separated by two or three generations. The outstanding characteristics of behavior between such relatives are affection and the rendering of assistance. We noticed on many occasions that young children take care of their grandparents, especially if the old people are partially incapacitated. Old people are very fond of children. When young married people separate, grandparents sometimes take and rear the children.

[128]

The data from the role profile tests can be organized by question as well as by role. That is, the behavior of all relatives on any one question can be considered together rather than the behavior of any one relative on all

125 157 554 602 [128] [594] [476] questions as has been done above. The former kind of analysis facilitates comparisons of all roles on any question. This comparison is given in Freed (1960, 369-70) and reveals several interesting features of Washo social organization. First, the importance of the nuclear family is clearly shown, especially the father, mother, son and daughter relationships. Second, men cooperate with men and women with women. Third, although authority in the society rests in the older people, father's siblings have little authority over brother's daughters and mother's brother has little over sister's son. Fourth, the principal hostile relatives for both men and women are older women: father's sister, mother's sister, and older sister. Fifth, both patrilineal and matrilineal relatives seem to have equal importance in Washo social organization.

121 128 This paper has presented a reconstruction of aboriginal Washo social structure and has noted the changes that have taken place since pre-white times. The descriptions of role behavior are based upon data from the modern Washo, but are thought to give some suggestion of aboriginal Washo role behavior because the Washo have retained their group identity and practice, in modified form, a number of aboriginal culture patterns.

Notes

122 104 1. The field work upon which this paper is based was supported by a grant from the Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, to whom my thanks are due. Unless noted otherwise, Washo words are written in a phonemic system devised for Washo by William H. Jacobsen, Jr., who did his work under the Survey of California Indian Languages, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.